(SRI K. H. RANGANATH)

Therefore the member has not annexed to his notice the required Governor's assent and further I do not know anything in the Bill whether the recommendation is obtained or not. Unless and until the sanction or the recommendation of the Governor is obtained, the notice shall not be valid. Further, Sub-Rule (2) under Rule 65 says :

> "The period of notice of a motion for leave to introduce a Bill under this rule shall be fifteen clear days unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made at shorter notice."

I do not know whether the Hon'ble Member gave a notice to the Bill and whether clear 15 days have elapsed and if it is not allowed, the Speaker has to use his discretion under the rule to allow a member to introduce. Under these circumstances, the member is not empowered to introduce the Bill under Rule 67 as he has not fulfilled all the provisions contained under Rule 65.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—I support what has been stated by our learned friend Sri Siddaveerappa. Article 207 clearly says :

> "That a Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in Sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of Article 199 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor."

Clear 15 days have not elapsed on 19th July 1967 as per sub-rule (2), Rule 65.

SPEAKER'S RULING *Re* : INTRODUCTION OF THE MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1967

MR. SPEAKER.—A point of order was raised as to whether the Hon'ble Sri Siddiah Kashimath is competent to introduce this Bill in this House. Various aspects were urged. Mr. Siddaveerappa first of all contended that so far as the introduction of the Bill is concerned, a period of 15 days notice has to be given unless the Speaker exercise his discretion to permit its introduction earlier than that, and further he went on saying that the Speaker should give the reasons for exercising his discretion. At a later stage, he has however stated that they cannot understand the discretion of the Speaker though the discretion of the Speaker cannot be questioned. This Bill is an amending Bill and matters covered by that are within the cognisance of the House and the members should have full scope to discuss this because it is a question of enhancing the emoluments. I am not concerned with the introduction or discussion. It will be passed if it is accepted by the majority in full accordance with the provisions of the rules. The House also remembers that it

was taken up some days back. It was then pointed out that they did not get copies of it. It is now admitted, printed, copies have been circulated and I have seen that copy and read through it. There are a few points a perusal of which will not take a long time say five minutes. But the point is as to whether I can exercise discretion or not and whether fifteen days notice has been observed. The Members will kindly know the inclusion of the bill in the Agenda is with my consent only. It is far from saying I will not give consent though it is included. Therefore, it was included with my knowledge, otherwise it cannot be and it was introduced on a day when there was Government business. The indication is that the members are not unwilling to discuss this. Opposition to the Bill is something different from saying that it should not be introduced. Opposition is always on merits. Therefore, I take it that so far as the introduction it concerned, as I have understood the House, majority is not against introduction.

11-30 A.M.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—How do you know it? We are not entering into the merits of the Bill. We know our speaker must give such a ruling that it must be a precedent for the entire country. We are only anxious that the rule should not be deviated even by a hair-breadth unless and until there are weighty reasons to give it up or deviate from normal rule of 15 days notice. I am canvassing your opinion so that you should not waive that. Moreovar, this financial implication is given to us only today and that too it is printed on 24th. Therefore, it shall be deemed that it shall be given to us on 24th of this month.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Mr. Siddaveerappa bowing down to the ruling thinks that the discretion that is being exercised by the Speaker of this Assembly must be placed on such a high pedestal that all other legislatures must look at it with faces up and always feel that is the very high est that has been said and done in the most appropriate fashion. I very well appreciate his desire. I shall try to adhere to it to the maximum extent possible. But at the same time he asked me how do I know the opinion of the majority. I will ask him to go and request the members and find out their opinion. But to the extent the members who came and expressed to me and from the cricumstances attendant here, I am inclined to feel that many are not against it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Speaker has got a fundamental right to hold his opinion. Otherwise he will be subordinate to you.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅನುಮಪಷನ್ ಸರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That presumption is not Correct. I will deal with the next point. The other point raised is there are two articles in the Constitution which offer insurmountable bar to the introducation of the Bill. Two articles quoted are article 199 with special refernce to clauses (a) to (f) and article 207. The provisions of clauses (a) to (f) deal with

(MR. SPEAKER)

various matters *inter alia* and drawing of moneys from consolidated founds. Reliance is placed on clauses (a) to (f) where the word 'consolidated found' is used. It is crystal clear that the amounts noted for defrayingthe expenses provided for in this Bill which when it is passed if at all into an Act will entail drawing moneys from the consolidated fund, and therefore they say that strict compliance of the provisions of articles 199 and 207 should be made. The conditions are that there must be a recommedation of the Governor for its introduction. Article 207 deals with a slightly different aspect, namely, recommendation of the Governor for its consideration. In the arguments that were addressed by the Hon'ble Member Mr. Siddveerappa who I may incidentally mention was one of the members of the Contituent Assembly which enacted this article he said that article 199 exactly applies to this Bill. I wes very much impressed because of his personal knowledge and because he lived through the debate that has taken place when this article was framed, discussed and enacted. One little point perhaps he missed. It is said in article 199 that if the Bill in question relatates *only* to that and nothing else, then article 199 applies. There is the word 'only' there which I might point cut and that has been the subject matter of decision by the Supreme Court and the High Courts where they have emphasised the word 'only'. The opening sentence of article 199 says, 'For the purpose of this Chapter, a Bill shall be deemed to be a Money Bill if it contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following matters "If it is a composite Bill, these provisions *plus* something else, then article 199 does not apply. That is the interpretation, not my interpretation but the interpretation of the Supreme Court and the Interpretation of the High Court. It is said that article 199 deals with both the stages. It is not only for introduction. Therefore, article 199 does not apply. But the other power which he has mentioned has to be kept clear though in the midest of his persuasive argument, Mr. Siddaveerappa might have lost sight of it. Articles 199 and 207 have to be kept apart. Article 207 is with regard to consideration of the Bill and not with regard to the introduction of the Bill.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Article 207 says: 'A Bill or amendment making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clsuse (1) of article 199 shall not be introduced or moved except on the recommendation of the Governor.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Bill of the type which is here does not come under article 199. The proviso to article 207 says:

> "Provided that no recommendation shall be required under this clause for the moving of an amendment making provision for the reduction or abolition of any tax."

SRI K. H. PATIL.—For reduction it may not be necessary. But for increased expenditure, even moving of amendment requres Governor's sanction under article 207.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is not an original Bill. This is an amending Bill. Therefore for introducing the original Bill consent was not necessary. Recommendation has been given for the original Bill.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Even for moving of an amendment, specific recommendition of the Governor is required.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Mr. K. H. Patil seems to think that certain aspects will be missed hy me.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—It is my duty to bring it to the notice of the Chair. I cannot challenge your opinion on parliamentary procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That does not come in for comparison at all A slight mixing up of the idea lies in thinking that the Bill—amending Bill—a Bill or the amendment. With regard to the Bill as it was then considered, article 207 comes in directly, But it is not proper to say—a Bill or amending Bill. Article 207 does not cover introduction. This is not the first time that the matter has come up. All that is wanted is recommendation of the Governor. The recommendation of the Governor has been received and it is already communicated to me that the Governor has recommended its consideration.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.— On what date, Sir ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Have a little patience. I will give the date. Perhaps I may add one word more to the ultra vires nature and to that extent, it is not done generally.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—May I please intervene for a minute, Sir, it is a simple point because it is my duty to bring it to your kind notice before you give your ruling, otherwise I feel that the point may be missed.

You were pleased to say that the amendment means, that the Bill is introduced and amendment is passed. That is not the case. The article is quite clear. If that amendment to the Bill was there, then Governor's recommendation is not necessary, because every Member has a right to bring in an amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member goes wrong.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—No, Sir, it is my bounden duty and my right to point out Sir, that the amendment also requires Governor's recommendation. There are two specific stages—one is at the time of moving and another is at the time of introduction.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Siddaveerappa wanted the date.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I only want to say that before your final ruling is given, you may kindly consider. My friend Mr. Ranganath has already brought it to your notice the amendment making provision. It is in this context I said that both will have to be conjointly examined. Now the point is, there is already a Bill. If you consider it as an amending Bill, undoubtedly, it only amounts to an amendment. But even

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA)

that amendment, so long as it has a financial implication of enhancing the tax burden or the financial burden on the State, it requires the formal consent of the Governor and that consent, as we could see, we do not know on what date it is given. Certainly it is not given on the date on which this Hon'ble Member gave notice of his intention to move this Bill. On that day financial schedule was not given and on that day the Governor's consent also was not secured. But if they withdraw and a regular notice is given if he is entitled to, is a different matter. As I have been repeating, I am not entering into the merits and demerits. Let it be made pucca, that is all.

Sri DIGAMBAR RAO BALWANT RAO (Aland).—On a point of order Sir, One suggestion with regard to the construction of article 199.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am showing a lot of patience. When the ruling is being given, the Member cannot raise a point of order.

Sri DIGAMBAR RAO BALWANT RAO.—This point also may be borne in mind while giving the Ruling Sir. I have gone through both the Bills and what I have found is, both of them deal with the financial matters from the beginning to the end. These provisions contain matters relating to money and nothing else. My contention is that that it may be strictly considered as money Bill and nothing more than that. That is my submission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then the Member should not raise it as a point of order. I have permitted him to reinforce what has been said. He must never raise a point of order when the Speaker is delivering a ruling.

Sri Siddaveerappa wanted to know the date. I am saying I have got here the recommendation of the Governor which reads as follows:

> "in pursuance of clause.....I.....Governor of Mysore do hereby recommend that the Mysore Minister's Salaries (Amendment) Bill be considered by the Mysore Legislative Assembly."

Sri Siddaveerappa raised another aspect. What is the date: the date is 24-7-67. I will have it placed on the table of the House. There is nothing confidential about it.

A further point practially putting into the mouth of Sri K. H. Ranganath said that it applies to the Bill or amending Bill and that the provisions are mandatory. I would also add in view of what has been said that the recommendation required under 207 is only so far as not making provision for any of the matters specified in sub-clauses (a) to (f) of clause (1) of article 199 and I have already ruled that it is only with regard to that and nothing else. Therefore, article 207 does not stand as a bar for its introduction and so far as recommendation is concerned, the recommendation is there. Therefore, as to whether it is necessary or not does not arise. That is my ruling.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—His point has not been dealt with in the Ruling Sir, namely in all financial matters it is only the treasury bench that will have to move and I want to know it for my future guidance, whether any of us also can move any measure which has financial implication.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Mr. Siddaveerappa reminds me that one more aspect is not covered by the Ruling. I do not know whether he has got any specific article in mind, to say that there is a division as money matters and non-money matters. I do not think there is any classification of that type. All that is said is, a Bill may be introduced by the Members. The Treasury Banch is entitled to bring certain Bills and so far as introduction of the Bill is concerned, articles 199 and 207 lay down a procedure. And I do not know how I can shut out a member from bringing the Bill. To say that a money Bill cannot be brought by any other Member presupposes as to the contents and the concept of a money bill. What the member has got in his mind, I do not know. Money Bill has been defined in the article of the Constitution. If he has that concept in his mind, then the only conditions are recommendation of the Governor at two stages *viz.*, introduction and consideraction. And so far as bringing of any other Bill is concerned, he may bring it and I will not stand in the way.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Can I introduce a Bill for enhancing taxation or reduction of taxation ? I want a ruling so that we want a guide line. We need not waste time in this House. All this discussion could have been avoided if the back-door method had been avoided and the Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs himself had introduced the Bill. We want to have a definite ruling from the Chair whether in matters of finance, and taxation measures, measures having financial implications, which will increase the tax burden of the people, can it be introduced by us on this side of the House we want a finding.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. Now Mr. Siddaveerappa wants a finding. Perhaps he thinks he is in a Court. The Speaker never gives a finding. The Speaker gives ruling. And ruling when ? When the Point of Order arises and when the hon'ble Mr. Siddaveerappa brings a bill. Then I will deal with it and give a correct ruling.

(*Laughter*)

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ಪೀಪಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿರೋಧಿ ಶಾಸಕದಳ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿರೋಧಿ ಶಾಸಕದಳ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಯಾವುದೇ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಶಾಸನಕರವೇತನ ಏರಿಕೆಯ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡ ತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸವಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ದಳದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಅಡಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಪ್ರಸಾಪವನೆ ನಿಲ್ಲಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರ ಪೈಯ್ಯಕ್ತಿಕ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪ)

ವಾದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಕೈ ಹಾಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಸೇರಿಯವ ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ನಾನು ಅರ್ಧಗಂಟೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದೆ, ಸ್ವತಂತ್ರ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಇಂಥಾ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರೂ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನೂ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾವು ರಚನೆಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಯುಕ್ತ ವಿರೋಧಿ ಶಾಸಕದಳ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ ಅವರು ಇದ್ದರು. ಈ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದಳದವರು, ಬೇರೆ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದು ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮದ ಚಟುವಟಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಮೈಸೂರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪ್ರಚಾರ ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ, ಅವರು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಈಗ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ರೂಲಿಂಗಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಬಾಕಿ ಇನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಜನತೆ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಾರದು. ತಾತ್ವಿಕ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಲ್ ಆಗಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಕೋತಿ ಮೊಸರು ಅನ್ನವನ್ನು ತಿಂದು ಮೇಕೆ ಬಾಯಿಗೆ ಒರಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಪಾರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿ ವ್ಯವಹಾರದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯನವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಂಥಾ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಇವರು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Is this a debate? I am not allowing everybody to speak. I will hear Sri S. Gopala Gowda. It is not possible to hear everybody. If everybody wants to speak, I will shut out Sri Gopala Gowda also.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹು ಜನರ ಸಮ್ಮತಿ ಇರಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ, ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ, ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ನಂಬಿಕೆ, ತಮ್ಮ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He can oppose it. Can I prevent its introduction? What kind of talk is this?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಅದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಮತ್ತು ಉಪ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳೂ ಇವೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತಿನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇದೆ. ಇವರು ದೊಡ್ಡ ತಪ್ಪನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂವೇಹವಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If there are some feelings to be expressed and if I allow time for it to everybody, how can you maintain order? I do not know.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತು, ಇದು ಮನಿಬಿಲ್ಲು, ಇದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಮತ್ತು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಕೂಡ ಇಂಥಾ ಒಂದು ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೂ ಇರಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರಾಜಕೀಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರೂ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರೂ ಸಹ ಇದನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು, ಇದು ಅವಸರದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇದು ಶಾಸನಕರ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ವಿಷಯ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಧಾನ

ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆಳುವ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಪೂರ್ವ ಭಾವಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿಯೋಜಿತವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಬುಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರಿಂದ ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಇದು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವವನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಕ್ಷಣದಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ್ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮನೂಡೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ಸುಕರಾಗಬಾರದು, ಮನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಮನೂಡೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆಯನ್ನು, ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

12 NOON

† Sri S. SHARANA GOWDA INAMDAR.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to say a word here.

Sri H. Siddaveerappa quoted something during his speech. I want to make it clear that Sri Siddiah Kasimath who is going to move a motion for introducing this Bill, is doing so in his own individual capacity. The Swatantra Party as such has not sponsored it. The members of this august House are entitled to move any Bill in any matter before this House under the rules and in that capacity he intends to move and he can move in his own capacity and not on behalf of Swathantra Party.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Sir, one word I want to say.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not allowing Sri Bangarappa. I will make the position clear. I have heard and the House has heard more than one member. I do not know what they are going to say till they get up and start speaking. I do not want to shut out anything ; I do not want any member to feel that he has not been given a chance. But, if this goes on, I have to enforce the rules that nothing except what is provided in the agenda is allowed and that according to the rules. Having given an opportunity to any member or such of the members to voice what they feel on behalf of the United Front and the Swatantra Party, I must say, political considerations and party affiliations do not come under the rules. Parties exist for the purpose of bringing the ideologies to the public and try to show how the Government is carried on. If the United Front thinks that a member is doing something which this United Front does not feel proper, I am not concerned.

(Sri M. S. Krishnan interrupted)

I am not allowing ; the hon. member knows how Sri Bangarappa was denied the chance ; I am not allowing.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.— * * *

(Sri M. S. Krishnan interrupted.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. Do not record anything that Sri Krishnan says.

*** Matter expunged or not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

(MR. SPEAKER)

Members who spoke till now have expressed at length and considerably. All that they have said is not anything that will convince the House to say that the Bill should not be introduced. They said that Sri Siddaiah Kasimath as a member of the Swatantra Party and that the party as such has not given him leave. I do not think rules provide for that leave being granted by a party. Similary, the Leader of Opposition Sri Sivappa said that there are all parties united in opposition and Sri Siddaiah Kasimath is one among them and that he participated in some other occassions and therefore it is not proper to introduce this Bill. I do not think that there is anything of that aspect so far as the introduction of the Bill is concerned.

Sri K. H. Ranganath said he would oppose. I do not know what he wants to oppose before it is introduced.

Sri Siddaiah Kashimath may move the Bill.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967.

I beg to move for leave to introduce the Mysore Ministers Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1967.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Can introduction come together or differently? There are two motions there. They must come one by one. If the Hon. Ministers want, let their Bill come up first. What is this hustling Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised that two Bills cannot be introduced one and the same time. I entirely agree; let ths member introduce the first one.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH.—Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce the Mysore Ligislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1967."

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶಿಮಠ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ.....

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Under rule 71 we have a right to oppose.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ ಕಾಶೀಮಠ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಸಂಬಳಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ವಿಧೇಯಕವನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುನ್ನ ನಾನು ಯಾರಿಂದಲೂ ಸಹಾಯ ಕೇಳಿದೆ ಸ್ವತಃ ನನಗೆ ಈಗ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂಬಳ ವಗೈರೆ ಸಾಲದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಜೀವನದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಷ್ಟಕಾರ್ಪಣ್ಯಗಳಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈಗ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ರೀತಿಯ ಅಂತಕವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ನನಗೆ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ 150 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ ಮತ್ತು 100 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಭತ್ಯೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನವರ ಯಾವುದೂ ಸಾಲದಾದ್ದರಿಂದ, ಮುಂಬಾಯಿ, ಆಂಧ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಬಿಹಾರ ಮುಂತಾದ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೂ 250 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಂಬಳ, 150 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ತುಟ್ಟಿಭತ್ಯೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇಲ್ಲೂ ಕೊಡುವುದು

ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈಗ ಜೀವನ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಆ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಷ್ಟವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅನುಭವಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಯಾರ ಚಿತಾವಣೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ನಾನೇ ಸ್ವತಃ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ನನಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನನ್ನ ಸ್ವಯಂಪ್ರೇರಣೆಯಿಂದ, ನನಗಿರುವ ಅಡಚಣೆಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—We oppose it...

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—You must give an opportunity to the members who oppose the motion. All of us are, except Sri Siddaiah Kashimath, who has been purchased by Congress, are opposingt he motion.

Sri V. N. PATIL (Humnabad).—I am opposing it as a single member. I must be given a chance to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The rule says 'member'. But the member is converting the word 'member' into 'members'

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್ (ಮೂಡಿಗೆರೆ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವ ರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Houseಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಲು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಈಗ ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತೆಂದು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಸದ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೆರಿಟ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳದೆ 65 ಮತ್ತು 67ನೇ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಾಲಂಗಳೇನಿವೆ, ಅವುಗಳಂತೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾವ ದಿನ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂಬುದು ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪೊದಲಾಗಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ 67ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ಅವರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನೋಟೀಸಿಗೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿ ನಂತರ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅವರ ಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಉತ್ಸುಕತೆಯಿಂದ ಮಂಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ 67ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ.

"65 (1) Any member, other than a Minister, desiring to move for leave to introduce a Bill, shall give notice of his intention, and shall, together with notice, sumbit a copy of the Bill and an explanatory Statement of Objects and Reasons which shall not contain argument :

Provided that the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, revise the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

(2) The period of notice of a motion for leave to introduce a Bill under this rule shall be fifteen clear days unless the Speaker allows the motion to be made at shorter notice.

66. If notice is given by a member other than a Minister of a motion for leave to introduce a Bill or to move an amendment which, in the opinion of the Speaker, cannot be introduced or moved save with the previous sanction of the

(ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಹೆಚ್. ರಂಗನಾಥ್)

President under article 304 of the Constitution, the Speaker shall, as soon as may be, after the receipt of the notice, refer the Bill or the amendment to the President and the notice shall not be placed on the list of business unless the President has communicated to the Speaker that the previous sanction has been granted or is not required.

67. If the Bill is a Bill which under the Constitution cannot be introduced without the previous sanction or recommendation of the Governor, the member shall annex to the notice such sanction or recommendation conveyed through a Minister, and the notice shall not be valid until this requirement is complied with".

ಸ್ಪಾಮಿ, ರೂಲ್ 67 ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾದರೂ ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಆ ನೋಟೀಸಿಗೆ ಲಗತ್ತಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಅವಗಾಹನೆಗೆ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಅದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅಂಥ ಅವಸರವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇಂಥ ಅವಸರ ಅವಸರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಯಾರ ಚಿತಾವಣೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಸ್ವಯಂಪ್ರೇರಣೆಯಿಂದ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅನುಮಾನದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೇಳುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅವಸರವಿದ್ದರೆ, ಕಳೆದ ಫೆಬ್ರುವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವತ್ರಿಕ ಚುನಾವಣೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ, ಆ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಯಾವ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮುಂದೆ ನಾನು ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗೆದ್ದರೆ ನನ್ನ ಸಂಬಳಸಾರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನಿತರ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರವನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಅನುಮತಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದು ಲಕ್ಷಾಂತರ ಜನರು ಕಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದು ಅವಸರ ಅವಸರದಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥಾದ್ದು ಸಾಧುವಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತ್ಯಾ ಮಂಡಿಸದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to be convinced whether I should allow further debate on this subject.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Yes, Sir, in view of the importance of it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am not satisfied that every Member who wants to have his say should be given a chance to speak.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Each party may be given a chance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would allow one or two members to speak.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—We have not merged ourselves; we retain our individuality; we have given it in writing. It is a united front of all the Opposition parties, and Mr. Sivappa is our leader.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If every member says that I do not know the party and that I must recognise him and give him the right to speak, what am I to do?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ (ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಆ ರೀತಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಯಾರೂ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ.

(*Hon'ble Members Sri M. S. Krishnan and Sri Gangadhar rose*).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will adjourn the House now and I will allow one or two members to speak. If every one claims that he has a right to speak, I cannot allow that.

The House will now adjourn to meet at 1 P.M. on Monday.

———

The House adjourned at Twenty-five Minutes past Twelve of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Monday, the 31st July 1967.

———